

Remarks

This paper is in response to the Office Action mailed October 26, 2005. Claim 1 is being amended and claims 16-19 are being added. In view of the above amendment to claim 1 and following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-15 and consideration and allowance of claims 16-19.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 10-12, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Marmaropoulos (U.S. Pat. Appl'n No. 2003/0202003). Marmaropoulos discloses a display device including a rotating mechanism that turns the display device viewing area. The rotating mechanism is activated by an activation mechanism, such as a switch, that initiates rotation of the display device viewing area independent of the image displayed in the display device viewing area. See paragraphs [0037]-[0041] of Marmaropoulos. In one embodiment of the device disclosed in Marmaropoulos, the image displayed in the display device viewing area is also initiated by the activation mechanism. See paragraph [0042] of Marmaropoulos.

Contrary to the assertion in the Office Action, nothing in Marmaropoulos discloses or suggests that the activation mechanism, or any other control device, dynamically synchronizes the displayed image with the movement of the display device. Marmaropoulos does disclose controlling the movement of the monitor using a control loop which detects and corrects for the error in position of the monitor versus a defined target position. See paragraph [0031] of Marmaropoulos. However, Marmaropoulos does not disclose or suggest that the defined target position has any relation to the image displayed by the monitor. Moreover, none of the cited references disclose or suggest a control unit including a control loop synchronizing monitor movement caused by an actuator unit with image information displayed on the monitor.

The device disclosed in the present application includes an actuator unit that moves a monitor and a control unit controlling the actuator unit to dynamically synchronize movement of the monitor with the image information displayed on the monitor. See paragraph [0034] of the present application. Claim 1 is being amended to more clearly claim the invention and recite "a control unit (12) controlling said actuator unit (11) to dynamically synchronize movement of the monitor (10) with the image information displayed on the monitor (10)."

As discussed above, Marmaropoulos merely displays image information on a moving monitor. Nothing in Marmaropoulos or any of the other cited references disclose or suggest

dynamically synchronizing movement of the monitor with the image information displayed on the monitor. Therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 1 is allowable over Marmaropoulos. Claims 2, 6, 8, 10-12, and 14 depend from claim 1 which, as discussed above, Applicant believes is allowable over the cited references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 10-12, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e).

In the Office Action, claims 3, 4, 13, and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marmaropoulos. Claims 3, 4, 13, and 15 depend from claim 1, which as discussed above, is believed allowable over the cited references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 3, 4, 13, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

In the Office Action, claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marmaropoulos in view of Badger (U.S. Pat. No. 5,973,664). Claim 5 depends from claim 1, which as discussed above, is believed allowable over the cited references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

In the Office Action, claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marmaropoulos in view of Ichimura (U.S. Pat. No. 6,801,426). Claim 7 depends from claim 1, which as discussed above, is believed allowable over the cited references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).


In the Office Action, claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marmaropoulos in view of Mathews et al. (U.S. Pat. Appl'n No. 2002/0109665). Claim 9 depends from claim 1, which as discussed above, is believed allowable over the cited references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 16-19 are being added. Newly added independent claims 16 and 18 include the limitation of "said control unit including a control loop synchronizing the monitor movement caused by said actuator unit (11) with the image information." This limitation is disclosed in paragraph [0034] of the present application, and is thus, not new matter. As discussed above, none of the cited references disclose or suggest a control unit including a control loop

synchronizing monitor movement caused by an actuator unit with image information. Claims 17 and 19 depend from claims 16 and 18, respectively. Therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 16-19 are allowable over the cited references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests consideration and allowance of claims 16-19.

Claim 1 is being amended and claims 16-19 are being added. In view of the above amendment and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-15 and consideration and allowance of claims 16-19. No additional fees for filing this response are believed to be due. However, if such fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge them to deposit account no. 17-0055.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Daniel G. Radler', written over a horizontal line.

Daniel G. Radler
Reg. No. 43,028
Quarles & Brady LLP
411 East Wisconsin Avenue
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202
Tel. No. (414) 277-5749